



**The EU's foreign, migration and security policies:  
A transatlantic perspective**

EUI Max Weber Programme and James Madison University  
9<sup>th</sup> Graduate Symposium, 18<sup>th</sup> April 2016

EUI, Badia Fiesolana, Max Weber Common Room



The Max Weber Programme and the James Madison University's M.A. Program in European Union Policy Studies are pleased to announce the 9th Joint Graduate Symposium.

The symposium gives JMU's MA students in European Union Policy Studies an opportunity to present and discuss their own research with Max Weber Fellows and the wider EUI community in an academic setting. In the context of the deepest challenges for the European Union since its creation, symposium papers discuss this year EU policy-making in the face of current challenges, technology and security issues, EU enlargements as political instruments, as well as the more general foreign policies of the EU. As the partnership between the European Union and the United States is more than ever the cornerstone of political stability on the Continent, the Symposium will end with a keynote lecture of U.S. Ambassador to the EU Anthony Gardner.

**Symposium Organizers:**

Emmanuel Comte, MWP, [Emmanuel.Comte@EUI.eu](mailto:Emmanuel.Comte@EUI.eu)  
Trajche Panov, EUI SPS, [trajche.panov@eui.eu](mailto:trajche.panov@eui.eu)  
Caterina Paolucci, JMU, [paoluccx@jmu.edu](mailto:paoluccx@jmu.edu)



## **EUI Max Weber Programme and James Madison University 9<sup>th</sup> Graduate Symposium, 18<sup>th</sup> April 2014**

*Badia Fiesolana, MWP Common Room, EUI*

### **9:30 – 9:45 Opening Remarks**

- Caterina Paolucci, Academic Coordinator, JMU
- Karin Tilmans, Program Coordinator, MWP-EUI

### **Panel 1 (9:45-11:00): The foreign policies of the EU. Chair: Emmanuel Comte.**

- John Jordan Burns, “The Evolution of Migration Policy – U.S. Republicans vs. German Christian Democrats.” Discussant: Aitana Guia
- Meghan Gayle Neibuhr, “The Civil War in South Sudan and the European Union’s Response Within the United Nations.” Discussant: Jed Odermatt
- Jacqueline Aimee Severance, “Putin the EU first.” Discussant: Molly Pucci

11:00-11:30 Coffee Break (Upper Loggia)

### **Panel 2 (11:30-12:45): EU enlargements as political instruments. Chair: Caterina Paolucci.**

- Karissa Leilani Suarez Del Real, “The Migratory Effects of the 2004 Eastern Enlargement on the Roma Population.” Discussant: Julija Sardelic
- Shannon Theresa Rano, “Factors Affecting the Influence of the EU in Europeanization of Rule-of-Law in Candidate Countries: A Comparative Study of Turkey and the Western Balkans.” Discussant: Nisida Gjoksi
- Audrey Louise Lievens, “Accession or Concession: Turkey, the EU, and the Immigration Crisis.” Discussant: Katharina Lenner

12:45-14:15 Lunch upon invitation – students, professors, and discussants (Badia, Sala Rossa)



**Panel 3 (14:15-15:30): EU policy-making in the face of current challenges. Chair: Trajche Panov.**

- Dane Lawrence Farrell, “The Members Only Club or Paying to Play: An Empirical Analysis of Policy Advocacy Dynamics in the EU.” Discussant: Stefanie Reher
- Karah J. Fissel, “Crisis Management: A Comparative Analysis on Welfare Resilience in Spain, Sweden, and the United States.” Discussant: Olga Griaznova
- Logan Jacob Hoffman, “Competitive Nature: Analysing the EU's Competitive Advantage Over the US in Combating Climate Change.” Discussant: Jordi Teixido-Figueras

15:30-16:00 Coffee Break (Upper Loggia)

**Panel 4 (16:00-17:15): Technology and security issues. Chair: Chiara Steindler.**

- Meghan M. Pearson, “Cybercrime: A Billion Dollar Criminal Enterprise.” Discussant: Maria Grazia Porcedda
- Robert Benjamin Snook, “Cyber Attacks and EU Foreign Policy: How can the EU respond?” Discussant: Nadav Kedem
- Lewis Gregory Creech, “Predator vs. Protector: The Transatlantic perspective on Drones.” Discussant: Nadav Kedem

17:30- 18:30

Refettorio

**Keynote lecture**

**Anthony Gardner\***

U.S. Ambassador to the EU

**Chair : Prof. Joseph Weiler**

President of the EUI

**« US-EU Partnership; holding firm in a turbulent world »**

The European Union is facing a multitude of simultaneous challenges that have caused many to question some of the fundamental principles of the Union. In this context, the U.S.-EU relationship is even more important. Ambassador Gardner will discuss the United States and European Union’s role as essential partners in a turbulent world.

Followed by a Reception (Lower Loggia)



## **Symposium Paper Abstracts**

### **Panel 1: The foreign policies of the EU.**

**Jordan Burns**

#### **The Evolutions of Migration Policy – U.S. Republicans vs. German Christian Democrats**

The Republican Party (GOP) in the United States has transformed dramatically since the 1980s in regards to their immigration policy. The Christian Democrat's (CDU) immigration policy in Germany has undergone a transformation as well over the same time period. The historical analysis of this paper is broken down into four time periods since 1980, with the purpose of identifying what has driven each party's immigration policy over time. The following sections offer an in-depth look at the evolution of each party's immigration policy in order to understand what has shaped their transformations. The analysis will show that the political polarization amongst the political elites in the United States coupled with the rising anti-immigration sentiment amongst U.S. voters has led to the current views of the GOP. Subsequently, the coalition style of government in Germany allows the CDU to have more open policies. Germany's current demographic worries in terms of their aging labor force are also an important factor. The exigency to procure a new source of skilled workers fosters open immigration policy within the CDU. The economic capabilities of each country are examined as well, because the ability to absorb immigrants is essential to understand the forming of policy. In sum, the different styles of government play a much greater role in shaping each party's immigration policy than any other factor.

**Meghan Neibuhr**

#### **South Sudan and the European Union's Response Within the United Nations**

This paper addresses the civil war in South Sudan, providing background on the roots of the war and the current situation on the ground, and evaluates the policy the European Union has created to respond to this situation. The paper goes further by looking at the action that the European Union has taken to pursue this policy by looking at what it has done within the United Nations, an international organization devoted to taking action to maintain peace and improve human rights situations. It argues that, in this case, when in a larger international body with the opportunity to put into action its foreign policy, the European Union does not take unified action. Despite the European Union's legal personality, it is not recognized as a single body at the United Nations, thus each individual state represents itself and acts on its own at the United Nations. The European Union encourages each state to act according to the European Union policy in order to present the Union on the international arena, yet, as can be seen in the case of South Sudan, it does not act in a unified manner, and states pursue their own interests and preferences. The paper looks at both the European Union's member states' actions within missions on the ground as well as their records in the decision making process to initiate missions in South Sudan in order to argue this point. The European Union's



member states' interests and preferences are too varied to present the European interests and policy in a united manner in an institution like that of the United Nations that does not grant full membership to the European Union as a whole.

### **Jacqueline Severance**

#### **Putin the EU First: An Analysis of the European Union Interest and Response to Russian Activity in the Baltic States**

The Russian Federation has become an increasingly assertive actor in Europe since the beginning of the 2000's. As of now, the European policy towards Russia is very divisive, as different European Union member states have different interests at stake with their relations with Russia. While the new Russian activism seemed to be confined to non-EU countries, recently Russia has been accused of aggressive behavior towards members of the European Union, the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. American and European forces are responding to these threats in the form of NATO operations within these three countries. Despite the presence of NATO forces in the Baltics in anti-Russian function, the overall European policy towards Russia varies. Member states such as Germany have closer relations and interests with Russia whereas the United Kingdom, for instance is more sympathetic towards the Baltic States. One of the single most important caveats in this policy struggle is the European dependence on Russian gas. This dependence has led countries to overlook Russian violations of human rights in order to ensure European access to Russian gas pipelines and shale oil. This facet of Russian-EU relations and its effect on other EU internal policy as well as EU external relations will be explored in greater detail. This paper will explore the causal factors and interests that influence the European Union and its Member states' policies towards Russia, with particular attention to the consequences on the Baltic States. The paper will ultimately recommend a stronger reaction by European actors and NATO to Russian activity within the Baltic States.

#### **Panel 2: EU enlargements as political instruments.**

### **Karissa Suarez Del Real**

#### **The Impact of the 2004 and 2007 Eastern Enlargement on the Roma Population**

This paper seeks to argue that the principal reason as to why the European Union adopted anti-discrimination policies regarding the Roma was to appease Western European member states who expressed reservations about the 2004 and 2007 Eastern Enlargement. Eastern Europe has the largest population of Romani and because of their ethnicity, the Roma have been forced into the margins of society, facing poor living and social conditions; evidence of the violation of their human rights. However, attention to their human rights became accorded to secondary importance, replaced by the need of controlling Romani migration to Western European states in order to proceed with Eastern Enlargement. This paper analyses how Eastern Enlargement began to shape European policy toward the Roma, pushing for anti-



discrimination initiatives in Central and Eastern European countries that were up for accession into the EU. Subsequently, an assessment is made on whether the anti-discrimination policies kept Roma from migrating westward and if they weren't, why then was that the case? Overall, the aim of the anti-discrimination policies put in place to hinder Roma's from migrating to Western Europe, were not effective enough in bettering the condition of the Romani, not fully achieving the goal of integrating them in Eastern Europe, justifying the desire to migrate west.

### **Shannon Rano**

#### **Factors Affecting the Influence of the EU in Europeanization of the Rule-of-Law in Candidate Countries: A Comparative Study of Turkey and Serbia**

Enlargement within the European Union (EU) has become an essential aspect of European integration. Within the last 12 years, 13 countries have joined the European Union. Moreover, the EU possesses a goal of expanding European integration into its Southeastern neighborhood, to include the Western Balkans and Turkey. As the borders of the European Union continue to expand, especially in the region of the southeast, the EU brings with it its impact on countries' domestic political culture. Enlargement policy has always rested on the acceptance of the *acquis communautaire* in candidate countries. Together with the Western Balkans region, Turkey has been a longstanding candidate to EU membership. This paper attempts to analyze the EU's influence on the reform of candidate countries' rule-of-law in order to align with the *acquis communautaire*, by looking specifically at the countries of Turkey and Serbia. Moreover, the factors of "incentive to reform" and "state capacity" will serve as the independent variables when operationalizing the EU's influence on the rule-of-law within these countries, and will be quantifiably categorized on a scale ranging from "0-2". From the analysis conducted, it is concluded that obstacles exist within the independent variables for both Turkey and Serbia. Additionally, it is concluded that while Serbia possesses more of an incentive to reform than Turkey, Turkey's state capacity is better equipped to enforce and maintain changes within its rule-of-law.

### **Audrey Lievens**

#### **Accession or Concession: Turkey and the EU in the Immigration Crisis**

Although Turkey has attempted to join the European Union for decades, the country has often been seen as too controversial a choice by the EU institutions and member states alike. This is largely due to its majority-Muslim population, its size compared to the rest of the EU, and, most importantly, its frequent human rights violations. However, Turkey and the EU alike have recently been approaching the possibility of accession from new angles. With the Syrian immigration crisis showing no signs of stopping, the EU has turned to Turkey, whose strategic geographic location makes it a key player in managing the flow of immigrants from the Middle East into the EU. Turkey itself, which is now home to well over two million refugees, has turned to the EU for help as well. Through this mutual need for aid, Turkey and



the EU have reopened talks of Turkish accession into the EU, but with very different terms. While the EU still claims to put a high value on human rights in Turkey, their focus has turned to making sure that Turkey takes on as large a share of the burden in the immigration crisis. Turkey, as well, is bargaining for as much financial aid as possible in the crisis; it is under these terms that the plans for accession are moving forward.

### **Panel 3: EU policy-making in the face of current challenges.**

**Dane Farrell**

#### **The Members Only Club or Paying to Play: An Empirical Analysis of Lobbying Dynamics in the EU**

Concerns about the excessive level of influence wealthy and powerful interest groups have in policymaking processes around the world are at an all time high among everyday citizens. In this study we assess the nature of the interest group dynamics at work at the EU level of policymaking. We focus on the issue of access and what factors determine whether an interest group has access to the policymaking process or not. We incorporate a number of factors into the analysis that we believe to be significant measures of access, such as involvement in an expert group, consultative committee, intergroup, etc. After determining what level of access these different interest groups had, we tested them against other interest group features that were thought to potentially have an impact on access level. Some of these variables were cost of lobbying expenditures, coalition membership, level of interest, and EU funding. Contrary to expectations, the results of the study point to non-resource based factors such as coalition membership and the level of interest as the strongest influencers of an interest group's level of access.

**Karah Fissel**

#### **Crisis Management: A Comparative Analysis on Welfare Resilience in Spain, Sweden, and the United States**

The objective of this paper is to qualitatively compare welfare management of the 2008-09 economic crisis in the US and Europe by focusing on the differences in national government responses. Two traditional schools of thought, Austerity versus Stimulus, come into the debate, and are regarded when identifying a country's resilience to the external shocks of the global crisis. Due to polarizing welfare systems in Europe, Nordic and Mediterranean Welfare models are respectfully chosen with case analyses of Sweden and Spain. Originating claims are: depending on the level of the welfare model, the government will correlate their direct response to the crisis while keeping in mind their social welfare system. Final analyses conclude the welfare state was not of top priority to crisis management, and resiliency was achieved fully in Sweden, secondly in the US, and not much at all in Spain.





**Logan J. Hoffman**

**Competitive Nature: Analyzing the EU's Competitive Advantage Over the US in Combating Global Climate Change**

This paper argues that the European Union (EU) has a competitive advantage over the United States (US) in combating global climate change. Furthermore, the paper attempts to provide explanations as to why the EU has developed a competitive advantage over the US in regards to combating global climate change. The paper discusses the roles that both the EU and the US have played in recent climate change negotiations, notably the 2015 COP 21 conference in Paris. Next, existing literature on the roles of the EU and the US in regards to climate change and their actions to combat the problem is analyzed. After analyzing the existing literature, there is a section describing the methodology of the paper, including how and why the research was conducted. Following this, the paper develops the case that the EU has developed a competitive advantage over the US due to its lower access to fossil energy resources, the public's view on global climate change in both entities, and the different media norms found in the EU and the US. Finally, this paper concludes by acknowledging that the three explanations for the EU's competitive advantage over the US in combating global climate change that are discussed throughout the paper are indeed viable explanations.

**Panel 4: Technology and security issues.**

**Meghan Pearson**

**Fighting a Billion Dollar Criminal Enterprise: Coordination and Cooperation the Solution to Cybercrime**

The European Union defines cybercrime as criminal acts that are committed online by using electronic communications networks and information. Cybercrimes have increased worldwide; there is an estimated global cost of \$100 billion per year. In response to the surge in global cybercrime, the European Union has created a division within Europol, as well as a task force to combat this growing issue. The new division within Europol is called European Cyber Crime Centre (EC3) and the task force is called the Joint Cybercrime Action Task Force (J-CAT). The main goal of EC3 is to enhance cooperation and communication between the European Union and other countries, while J-CAT has the operational goal to respond to potential or current cyber threats by adapting quickly to the rapidly evolving typologies and methods of cybercrime. These two departments focus investigations on Internet enable crimes such as online sexual exploitation of minors, high-profile criminals and identify theft rings. In the research, that has been gathered J-CAT has proven international cooperation and coordination is necessary for success. The policy paper outlines specific characteristics of the EC3 and J-CAT that have led to the successful completion of joint investigations on an international scale. Through the recent success of J-CAT at the international and European level, this would be the model of future cybercrime divisions. As well as through, greater European and international cooperation and coordination there will be an increase in cyber criminals brought to justice.



**Ben Snook**

### **Cyber Attacks and EU Foreign Policy: How can the EU respond?**

In an ever-digitizing world, the European Union will increasingly find itself at the middle of cyber-conflicts. Specifically, malicious, state-sponsored cyber activity has the potential to harm the interests of the entire European Union – either by directly targeting European institutions, or individual Member States. As this policy paper will discuss, Member States have already been adversely impacted in recent years by what are suspected to be state-sponsored attacks. Subsequently, in light of the institutional complexities inherent to Brussels, this paper will address the many question marks surrounding what a foreign policy response at the European level might entail. If cyber-attacks are considered a form of military assault, does this effectively blunt the potential impact of the EU due to its lack of military power? Where does this place the response of the EU in relation to NATO? Should responses be carried out at Member State level, or should they come from a more coordinated, and potentially more impactful, European level? Exactly where within the EU should these responses come from – by which institution, and delivered by whom? The paper will consider these questions by first providing a rudimentary analysis of cyber-attacks. The second section will examine the EU’s Cyber Defense Policy Framework and its relation to NATO’s cyber-defense policy. The third section will analyze two notable cases of cyber-attacks – in Estonia and the United States – and what lessons might be learned from each. Finally, the paper will provide a pair of policy recommendations based on the notion that, while it is not a “state,” the EU must harness the foreign policy instruments already at its disposal – or develop new ones – to respond to external cyber threats. This will be followed by a conclusion regarding the future of EU cyber policy.

**Lewis Creech**

### **Predator vs. Protector, The Transatlantic views on Drones**

The different visions across the Atlantic regarding drones and unmanned vehicles present a complication in future collaboration in modern warfare and industry. Drones are developing into a cost effective and expedient way to transport goods, gather intelligence, and engage in war. The United States along with their ally Israel has led the world in pursuing this technology, but adoption in most of Europe has been less engaging. With so many vital sections of the transatlantic relationship involved with the evolution of drones it is an important discussion to have. The recent distinction proposed by the UK in naming their imported US drones “Protectors” instead of the American naming conventions “Predator” and “Reaper” illuminates these viewpoints. Economic and military efficiency factors have led the EU to begin to move away from their original position on drones. The UK and Europe in their move toward drone technology are trying to distance themselves from the negative connotations associated with the American programs. Legislation on both sides of the



Atlantic is inefficient to currently deal with the military, industrial, and commercial implications of the use of unmanned vehicles. At an EU level, the institutions have expressed interest in an EU wide set of standards for the use of drones to maintain sovereignty and dictate their use of the technology. The different views of drones in the transatlantic relationship, while growing closer, still present potentially problematic coordination issues in future military and industry capabilities.